

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 and 20-34 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 22, 25, and 31-34 have been amended to further clarify certain aspects of these claims, and without prejudice of or disclaimer to pursuing the subject matter of these claims in unamended or other forms in a continuation or other application. No claims have been canceled or added in this response.

In the Office Action mailed December 8, 2008, pending claims 1-9 and 20-34 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

- (A) The title was objected to;
- (B) The drawings were objected to;
- (C) Claim 33 was objected to because of a minor informality;
- (D) Claims 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112;
- (E) Claims 1-7, 9, and 20-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,909,226 to Takeda ("Takeda") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0184627 to Sasaki et al. ("Sasaki"); and
- (F) Claims 8 and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takeda, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0184771 to Yamamoto et al. ("Yamamoto"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,151,140 to Wilcox et al. ("Wilcox").

The undersigned attorney and his colleague, Aaron Poledna, wish to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on February 17, 2009, to discuss the present Office Action, the cited references, and the pending claims. The applicants request that this paper constitute the applicants' Interview Summary. If the Examiner notices any deficiencies in this regard, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to correct such deficiencies.

The following remarks summarize and expand upon the results of the February 17th telephone conference, and they also reflect the tentative agreement reached between the undersigned attorney and the Examiner during the telephone conference. For example, the following remarks reflect the Examiner's acknowledgement that the combination of Takeda and Sasaki cannot support a Section 103 rejection of amended independent claims 1, 22, 25, and 31. More specifically, the Examiner acknowledged during the telephone conference that the applied references to not disclose the features of these amended independent claims including a scanner lid positioned in a first region of the housing and a cartridge lid positioned in a second region of the housing outside of a periphery of the first region, the first region being laterally adjacent to the second region.

A. Response to the Objection to the Title

The title was objected to as allegedly not being descriptive. Without commenting on or conceding the merits of this objection, the title has been amended to read: MULTI-FUNCTION PERIPHERAL WITH REPLACEABLE INK CARTRIDGE AND ASSOCIATED SYSTEMS AND METHODS. Accordingly, the objection to the title should be withdrawn.

B. Response to the Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to for various alleged informalities. More specifically, the drawings were objected to for not showing the features of the L-shaped paper conveying path of claims 4, 6, 24, 28, and 30. As shown in the Replacement Sheet included herewith, Figure 4 has been amended to include the L-shaped paper conveying path 243 and the paper feeding chute 245, as described in the originally filed specification in at least the last paragraph on page 5 starting at line 23. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings in light of the features of claims 4, 6, 24, 28, and 30 should be withdrawn.

The drawings were also objected to for allegedly not showing the features of the control panel carried by the cartridge lid of claim 32. Without commenting on or conceding the merits of this objection, claim 32 has been amended to replace "a control

panel carried by a cartridge lid" to "a control panel on the cartridge lid." Accordingly, the objection to the drawings in light of the features of claim 32 should be withdrawn.

C. Response to the Objection of Claim 33

Claim 33 was objected to because of a minor informality. More specifically, claim 33 was objected to for depending from itself. Claim 33 has been amended to depend from claim 31. Accordingly, the objection to claim 33 should be withdrawn.

D. Response to the Section 112 Rejection of Claims 32-34

Claims 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. More specifically, claim 32 was rejected for including the features of the control panel carried by the cartridge lid. Without commenting on or conceding the merits of the Section 112 rejection, claim 32 has been amended to replace "a control panel carried by a cartridge lid" to "a control panel on the cartridge lid." Accordingly, the Section 112 rejection of claim 32 should be withdrawn.

Claim 33 was rejected on the grounds that the ink cartridge may not be always be exposed through the opening in the housing. Without commenting on or conceding the merits of this rejection, claim 33 has been amended to include that "the ink cartridge is capable of being exposed through the opening when the ink cartridge is in the replacement position." Accordingly, the Section 112 rejection of claim 33 should be withdrawn.

Claim 34 was rejected as allegedly being contradictory to claim 33. Without commenting on or conceding the merits of this rejection, claim 33 has been amended as explained above, and is not contradictory to claim 34. Accordingly, the Section 112 rejection of claim 34 should also be withdrawn.

E. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9, and 20-31 (Takeda and Sasaki)

Claims 1-7, 9, and 20-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takeda and Sasaki. As stated above, the Examiner acknowledged during the February 17th telephone conference that Takeda and Sasaki cannot support

a Section 103 rejection of amended independent claims 1, 22, 25, and 31. Accordingly, in light of this agreement, the Section 103 rejection of independent claims 1, 22, 25, and 31 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7, 9, 20, and 21 depend from base claim 1, claims 23 and 24 depend from base claim 22, and claims 26-30 depend from base claim 25. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 2-7, 9, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 26-30 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to their respective base claims, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

F. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 8 and 32-34 (Takeda, Yamamoto, and Wilcox)

Claims 8 and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takeda, Yamamoto, and Wilcox. Claim 8 depends from base claim 1, and claims 32-34 depend from base claim 31. The Office Action relies on Yamamoto for disclosing a control panel, and on Wilcox for disclosing a control panel that may be lifted up with the top portion of the imaging device. (Office Action, p. 20.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Yamamoto and Wilcox fail to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takeda to support a Section 103 rejection of base claims 1 and 31. For example, Yamamoto and Wilcox fail to disclose or suggest a scanner lid positioned in a first region and a cartridge lid positioned in a second region outside a periphery of the first region. Accordingly, claims 8 and 32-34 are allowable over the combination of Takeda, Yamamoto, and Wilcox for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claims 1 and 31, and the additional features of corresponding dependent claims 8 and 32-34. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of dependent claims 8 and 32-34 should be withdrawn.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicants accordingly request reconsideration of the application and a mailing of a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any

questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Cameron Pilling at (206) 359-6123.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



---

Cameron B. Pilling  
Registration No. 62,085

Date: February 25, 2009

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 25096  
Perkins Coie LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000